

ARCHIVE COPY

M 964

Must Remain in

Transcription Room

Monday, April 11, 1966

Mr. Nyland: Well, we have now some insulating material up there, so now, the tapes ought to be clear. We'll find out, huh?. Now most of the noise will come from the people. You know, the mike picks up the noise of the chairs and the movements and so forth. I used to attribute it to the smallness of the room when we were at 65th Street, because we sat too close together. And I think its nervousness is the difficulty probably just at the moment when they fall asleep. So now, what do we talk about tonight?

Who has questions or reports on tasks?

Q. I'd like to report on a task. My task was to take my glasses off while I was at work, once in the morning and once in the evening for an hour each time, and during this time I was supposed to try to remember myself, to try to wake up. The first time I did this, I was at work, and I seemed to notice that people were feeling sorry for me at this time. They were coming up to me and saying "Poor Jay, you have so much work to do" - and this realization was so strong that I thought "Wow" it's a good time to ask for a raise". And I actually went in and asked for a twenty dollar raise. And I'd only been working for the company for three months and I don't know, there was something very definite about the way I felt about the situation at the time."

Mr. Nyland: Did you get it?

A: Well he told me to come back the next day. The next day when I took off my glasses, he came to me and said he'd like to talk to me and the same thing happened because I felt that I knew what he was going to say and I said the exact right thing at the right time and it was almost as if there were strings attached. It sounds vague when I try putting it into words but again it was very definite and I got a twenty dollar a week raise. much laughter.

A. (cont.) It sounds funny but this feeling was very definite at the time and I tried to remember my place in life and I wasn't at all worried, I was very at ease with myself which is very unusual and I was quite sure of myself and it was very beautiful. The next day when I came to take my glasses off there was something different because before I realized what was happening the hour was almost gone and it seemed that I was daydreaming about all the money I had acquired, but this surge acted as a shock, it seemed and for the rest of the day I kept having periods of trying to wake up and seeing that I had fallen asleep and this was different because it had never been this way all throughout the day before, but gradually as the week went on I seemed to become aware of eyestrain and at first it never bothered me, and it was very hard, and it didn't seem to work as well, but when that end of the hour came along I realized that I was daydreaming.

Possibly if I'd made efforts under different circumstances I may have had better results. The first few days there was something different, it wasn't the same. I was completely identified with my pay raise and plans but the week was unusual for me in that I seemed to have had a contact. I was always thinking about the work, or more so than I usually do and it was a lot stronger and it seemed to take a larger part of my life, just the thoughts."

Mr. Nyland: Maybe you should tell your boss to take the twenty dollars back.

Maybe you don't deserve it.

A: I don't know, I tried to make the efforts but the results weren't there, I don't know whether I failed at my task or whether under different circumstances I would have made greater efforts and gotten better results. This I'm not sure of."

Mr. Nyland: Of course with a task, it's quite possible that after two days even, it wears off and particularly when the excitement is gone and you have

reached some kind of result in getting some more money; that then the interest, also, has waned and you're not sufficiently interested even, to remember how you happen to be, in the first few days, you know it's sometimes something like sitting on your laurels. You ought to do it for another week and see if you can bring back what your original taste was, but now, connect with something to which you were grateful for the first few days when you did it because there was then something that was quite definitely different from usual and was brought about by the glasses and the sympathy the other people may have felt. At least, for yourself, you were much more alive and much more interested in the reason the glasses were off for yourself, and you can bring it back again if you remember it. So make another attempt, use it in the same way but this time, never mind the twenty dollars. It is now for me. You understand what I mean now. Make a good attempt.

Q: Mr. Nyland, I was going to ask you a question two weeks ago that I would like to ask now. It is in relation to something you said to me in Boston. I'd like to make a statement before I say it. I feel since I've been with the groups and studying Gurdjieff and reading All and Everything, that up to this point right now, I've found out a lot of things which I've been skeptical about. This is from reading the books more than once and from putting into practice a lot of the things I've taken out of the books. To make sure that are actually the truth for me, and I find they are true for myself at the level that I am right now and from what I can see of myself in the situations and the things that are inside me. The question is once you said to me, and I don't know if I took it the right way even, that if I was to know myself as I am now that I would die now. That has stuck in my mind since you said it, and it has been there all the time and it keep recurring. I try to put into words for myself sometimes when I have a moment of awareness

and I could never describe it except that I feel that I am a particle in something. It is the only way I can describe it to myself. Now I'd like to ask you something, more about that.

Mr. Nyland: Did you understand what I meant at the time? Or did it bother you?

Answer: At the time I was beginning to understand, now I think I do understand but I don't know if I understand it clearly. I don't know if I took it too seriously the way you said it.

Mr. Nyland: I don't think it was too serious when it helped you. If it did.

Answer: It did.

Mr. Nyland: Then why would one be afraid for the seriousness of something if it can help one to wake up?

Answer: I have a tendency to overdramatize sometimes.

Mr. Nyland: Yes and that after all is quite an exaggeration isn't it? You see, it called back to your attention what you really might be but for yourself you don't know it and it could give you much more an inclination or an impetus toward finding out what you are. And in effect if one finds out what one really is, one cannot live with himself. It simply means that whenever I live I acquire a certain coating. I protect myself many times because I don't want to see what I really am. And I live then, sometimes for many years in a state of hallucination believing myself to be what I know deep down inside what I am really not. And when I want to face that, I find excuses why I don't have to face that as yet. And I postpone that. It's like a day of judgment that will come sometime but I hope it will never come, but I do know that it will undoubtedly come sometime and most likely at a time when I don't want it and for that reason I don't want to think

about it. But you see, when it helps you to come to yourself more and more and to find out what really the truth is and if because of that adding day after day or week after week a little bit more knowledge, my attitude towards myself also gradually changes and in the desire of wanting to see what I really am I build up something within myself with which I then can face certain facts which originally I could not face.

So for that reason it's good, that is, If I keep such a thing in mind that that is actually even if one does not understand it when it is converted into a wish to find out what I am really, then that has that kind of a good effect if it helps me at that moment to wake up.

Now, how it is at the present time is up to you. How much truth is there in what you actually know of yourself? And what particular things that you do know that you still interpret in a certain way in order to be able to be able to live with yourself, and that all such things gradually have to be dismissed and that you have to come down to the bottom of really, this is what I am. Finding out in the end, theoretically speaking now, was really nothing, and that from that time on, one starts to build up.

Now, no one will admit that for oneself because it's much too difficult. Each person has a certain value of himself and he loves to enlarge that value and believe in it even when sometimes he knows quite well it isn't entirely true. I know this from dealings with other people. When they tell me something that I know I'm not but they say it and perhaps they mean it and I want to agree with them because it's flattering to me. Seldom, I would say, Oh, no It isn't really true. And if I do say it is really not so, I have something

else, a certain form of vanity that I want them to know how little I think of myself and that becomes pride. We are very complicated that way. Sometimes I agree with someone who says I am nothing, hoping that the other person will say "Oh no, that isn't true" because you are something and then I'm again flattered, but I know it is not true, and lying by implication, or lying by merely assuming that someone else tells me something that I myself know much and much better, but if I can get away with it.

When I say that if a man is complicated it simply means that he is dependent much too much on the impression he makes on other people, and that what he wishes other people to believe, and if he repeats () for himself, that then gradually he starts to believe it himself. So that if one really wants to find out what is absolute truth for oneself one has to become absolutely impartial. You see, it is exactly this lack of impartiality that prevents us from waking up.

Every once in a while, I consider myself the way I say "Yes, I notice, I know this of myself, I know it." My memory then very often of what I have done. And then if it is something that is not entirely correct or that I am a little ashamed of, I will also find at that time excuses why I have done it and blame conditions and someone else, very seldom do I blame me, but if I blame myself, then I also will say, "Oh that happens to be my nature, that's the way I was brought up, that's the way I really am () This is what I know I am when I'm behaving a little badly () and then I have another excuse.

To come to the impartial observation of oneself, that is really to be ~~be~~ in an impartiality sufficiently interested to see what still exists, and at the same time to not have that interest extend to such an extent that I want to either change it, or like or dislike,. That I really am regarding myself completely cold. When I say it leaves me cold it

means that I don't want any feelings to enter into that kind of an observation of myself. Now how seldom this really happens that I am willing to accept myself as I am. Now particularly afterwards when I have to think about it then I am not as clear anymore as compared to an observation which takes place at the moment, then I allow my thoughts and my feelings simply to play their own part for my own self-satisfaction and I prevent it even at that time to see truth the way it is.

You see, impartiality of course, has to do with feelings () and the liking and disliking, call it a certain form of judgment. I say, in order to be able to live with oneself a little easier, that impartiality means also that I do not wish to become part of that what I now am identified with.

So, if it includes an identification with other people, to become impartial to their judgment and to become impartial to myself and my own judgment is a very big step that can only come gradually everyday adding a little bit more impartiality if I possibly can, and a little bit more, doing away with what was my own personal interpretation.

You remember sometimes, I use an example of a real scientist. You remember that? The scientist was investigating certain things and he has a research program for himself and in that particular pursuit he is interested in finding out let's say, a molecule of a certain substance ~~of~~ that he has made synthetically of which he is quite proud, because it meant a synthesis of different things, putting together and according to the theories that he has, that particular substance has a melting point of 95°. You see, that is his theory, naturally he is identified with it, it is his own, and he could never be impartial toward it. So now, he has this substance and he starts testing it out now by the melting point method and he finds it melts at 93°. So his whole structure of that which is his theory, based on

the melting point of 95° is completely knocked to pieces and the admission of the fact that it is 93 and not 95 will mean that he has to be impartial about himself because the facts as they are and as he determines it scientifically and without any interpretation on his own part happens to be different from that which is his own as it were, as a result of his own scientific endeavors leading up to the substance he has made, which, according to the theory should be melting at 95° . He is faced with a tremendous problem because he does not want to do away with his particular theory because he knows a great deal of work and perspiration went into it, at the same time he cannot deny that there is a difference of facts, one's a theoretical one, and the other is a practical one and that for him absolute truth is that the melting point is 93° . So what will he do? His whole name, everything he has built up, his reputation is exactly built on his theory and now he has to admit it is quite different.

Now you see, this is a question of impartiality. If he is a good scientist he will admit he has made a mistake, sometime, and that unfortunately the facts are against him. And he must say that it was a melting point of 93° and now he has to revise all his theories in order to make it conform to that what he has established as a fact. If I look at myself, and I want to have absolute truth it may be quite different from what I think I am. And also it may be quite different from what I wish to appear to other people. And then my personality is based on an idea that I have of myself and that is now knocked to pieces because in reality, now by means of some absoluteness I find out that it isn't so. The total structure of my whole building falls down.

I build up for myself a very different idea of what I am and to some extent I pride myself on being what I am, and many times when I say that I have accomplished it because of my own efforts, then I become

attached to it. And now I have to face the problem of objectivity. I have to face something that is a recording without an interpretation or, that I have to have that what I observe in exactly the same way that it really is instead of that what I would like it to be. And that is where my difficulty for impartiality comes in, and as I say, when I actually realize what I am, then I may not be able to stand it and I would prefer to die.

You see how what I mean? I continue with work and I have to make sure that whenever I talk about work I use a method that is absolute. The method has to be an objective observation and impartial criticism of what man is. That is Gurdjieff did not mince any words about it. He said it is that kind of an observation and a true observation has to be an impartial one and because of that kind of a fact which now has absolute value I have a chance to criticize it. In the light of what I think it was or would have liked it to be and what it actually is and my criticism is now based on a fact that I know to be so without any question and that from now on I have a foundation on which I can now stand and on which I can build further.

You see the destruction of much of what one wants to think about oneself has to go by the wayside, it has to be left.

I have to live if I can and if I can face it in such a way that I become simpler and simpler and that I become in reality that what I am as a body with a little bit of feeling and some kind of a mind, which is then, for me, an unconscious man but at least I have a chance that something else which I then call "I" is able to see it and have an interest in that, when it observes me and, again, being part of me, naturally, that interest becomes beneficent regarding the possibility of further growth of that what is now unconscious.* So if one wants to take this

particular problem you have to see it through from beginning to end. You cannot stop halfway and you may have to end up by considering yourself as nothing in order to find out yourself as becoming of some value. Continue to work but keep it much simpler for yourself.

Question: So little parts of yourself, as parts, sort of burn out?

Mr. Nyland: What do you mean burn out?

Question: That is, this self when it is under observation.

Mr. Nyland: It doesn't burn out. No-observation means that something starts to exist which has a certain quality and we call it objectivity. It is something that is separated from the rest of one's personality. And it now has a particular function to fulfill. And all it has to do is look at that which is unconscious.

I call it then the little "I" that starts to function as the beginning of an objective faculty. All it does now is to keep on, if it possibly can, observing that what is, that is - personality in doing, or sometimes feeling or thinking. And observation does not include any destruction of anything and is only a statement of fact of what really is the truth. And I will find the truth when I am impartial to that what I observe., what the little "I" is now observing. And I will know it is the absolute truth when it happens to be an observation simultaneous to the actual behavior form of the personality. So you have to visualize this as something I will call a little "I" starting to function somewhere and usually in the brain in a certain way simply for the purpose of observing that which is the body. And all the different manifestations of the body and whatever is the cause of such manifestations. It doesn't make any difference as long as it is an object which can be observed and that regarding that object, the observer is impartial and is willing to accept whatever it is in whatever condition it happens to be in. Now that in

itself does not mean any destruction. It simply means that I put whatever is the behavior form in a proper place so that now, whenever I happen to think about it, that is, if the little "I" starts to function sufficiently so that not only in the process of observing but also that it will have a mental capacity of a memory that by means of recalling such facts which are now absolutes that then, it might be possible for the little "I", having grown up sufficiently to have a certain form of judgment about what is right and what is wrong.

But you must remember that if the little "I" starts in the beginning it is very small and that at most of the little bit of trying to make a part of one's brain objective starts out with just a few cells which, more or less, get together for some reason or other, that is, that which really prompts a person to wish to wake up is something else in him that is of a different quality from his unconscious personality indicates. An assumption you might say that there is in man something of a higher nature or a different kind of quality than the unconscious state. Gurdjieff called it the magnetic centre. It is perhaps light, as a force, existing in man when man becomes aware of this life and the necessity as a responsibility for the continuation and maintenance of his life that he is responsible for life which has been given to him that he, when it has been given, can return it properly in case he dies. You see, it has to do with what is really life, as a philosophy and then, assuming that that exists as a concept in him, then, for some reason or other, he feels that as long as life is contained within his body, it has not the proper chance for further development, so then the reason for trying to find a road for objectivity is the help the possible development of himself, in order to free this form of life in him, and then, in that kind of a freedom, that life then makes its own, let's call it an (assurety?) without the help or without being encased as if in a prison in the body of a man.

So this you might say is a motivation of trying even to build something like an objective faculty. Because all the different subjective directions in which a man can go always will lead to a subjective result. And it will never lead to any absolute value because absoluteness means that it has to be free from any subjective interpretation.

So when this little "I" starts to function, what one has to do is really two things. One is that sufficient material is given for the growth of this little "I" so as to grow up and become an important factor.

The second is that what is being observed is willing to be observed. So if now the objective faculty starting in man, it is better if you listen, let it penetrate, even if you miss things you must follow the thread because if you write down things you forget and all of a sudden, there is a hiatus and you cannot overbridge when you reach it again. Try to live very carefully and almost, I would say, relatedly. It is much better, then you follow the logical sequence of the development of a thought.

If the little "I" has now material to work with you give it, or rather something in one gives the little "I" a chance to develop by giving it an exercise to observe me and then, when it can observe me and that what is in me as personality now being observed should not object to that kind of observation. When that relationship is established and by adding time and time and time again such efforts which we then call - to wake up - that is, to become objective regarding that what is now me as personality.

I have two things. One is something that is conscious because I call now consciousness an identification with objectivity, and that what remains unconscious, so then the personality of a man is not changed immediately into a conscious state. A personality does not become an individual simply by wishing it, but I can make something independent of my unconscious state which I then endow with the power to become conscious and when I keep on

feeding it, when it is mature it can start to have an influence by an observation process on that which it observes which happens to be my body and the manifestations.

The next step is now when it has what I call now a benevolent interest in that what is being observed, that then this conscious state starts to function by means of contact with that which is unconscious, and the unconscious state being lower than the conscious one will gradually be under the influence of the conscious state, changed into a more and more conscious condition, so that out of that return you might say, or again the merging of the little "I" with "it" - gradually a man could become conscious totally. //So even in that particular case it is not a question of losing any material forms, it is now a reconversion of what is now one kind of a manifestation to another one, and generally it would be called that man changes into a man who is more becoming what a man should be, or to use the terminology of Gurdjieff, that a man could become more harmonious and that he could be then under the influence of this "I", become really a conscious person, develop a conscience by, you might call it an overflow into one's heart and changing his feeling center, and also could develop then, a real will of the body.

You understand now, what I mean? There is no destruction. There is only a reorganization of certain things in a different way so that by that change of configuration man could become more than what he is. That in addition, he needs new material in order to grow further. Since he is incomplete, that kind of material is obtained from sources higher than himself. And it is for that reason that a man has to be open to receive such possible influences.

QUESTION: I have a picture which is in my mind. It is something round, like the sun. And then a planet, Earth, underneath. One question which

arose when you were talking was "How do we know when the little "I" or its little "I" is big enough so it can begin to influence?

MR. NYLAND: You won't have to worry about it. You see the little "I" growing out to maturity will know for itself, for "I"'s-self, when it has another task to fulfill. You see there is no necessity for further guidance because that which originally starts it, that is, magnetic centre, is of the same quality as that which is "I". Both being remnants. One is a remnant of consciousness of life. And the other being full-grown consciousness. In some kind of a form. Then this "I" having grown up to maturity now wishes to go out into the world to test its own strength. It is a logical result of anything that is living, that knowing he cannot be contained constantly or staying with, let's say, his father and mother, wants to go out into the world to prove to himself that he is a man. And the "I" has exactly the same kind of a realization. That as long as he was sufficiently sheltered he may have all the qualifications of an "I" but is, as yet, not sufficiently tested in ordinary life. So the logical place where "I" would go would be to go back to it to see if it could influence it, that is, personality enough, so that if it is actually stronger it naturally would affect it in such a way that what is higher in strength would change what is lower. I would never worry about it. I know very well that if "I" is there, then gradually this "I" already starts to take part in what is manifestation of man.

Then it goes slowly and it does not mean that it can be done constantly. But there are every once in a while little indications. Sometimes one says "Yes, I want to talk to you, but this time really from essence, this time from real essence, this time as if I am real absolute." You see one part makes conversations like that already when one starts to work.

How could it be if I were conscious? Questions of that kind come to the foreground that one starts to test; is my behavior correct from

the standpoint of objectivity, from the standpoint of Gurdjieff, from the standpoint of what a real man should be. As soon as one starts to work one will all the time have in front of himself something that is like an ideal man. What is an ideal man?

A lot of times one says "What is becoming to me? Is my behaviour in line with what it ought to be? You see, now I have facts upon which I can base it because I have learned to be free from my own interpretations. It is the only reason that objectivity is the only way that will give that kind of fact. As long as there is any kind of subjectivity, any kind of a thought or feeling, I never will reach the truth. I reach a relative truth which is very good as far as earth is concerned but to further the growth of man in this evolution it is not to be on earth all the time. All right?

QUESTION: It seems that what came to me out of what you have been saying is the man who is the scientist, who in the situations you describe has a theory such that something melts at 95°. And he discovers it melts at 93°. This is one kind of thing. Is there any connection between or any difference between the man whom Gurdjieff calls an obyvatel - someone who does something who's done it all the way through and who doesn't really care, at least this is my understanding, maybe I'm wrong, so I can find out?

MR. NYLAND: An obyvatel is a very simple man who because of experiences in life acquires a certain wisdom. More and more, he becomes independent of the opinions of others, simply because he concentrates on that what he is supposed to do and does that extremely well, so that no one else in the rest of the world can tell him how to do it better, and that if even God came and told him, he would tell God off. "Mind your own business, I know what I am, and I know what I'm doing." A man like that can only, in such simplicity, dare to say this. You see, it is not the

same as a scientist because a scientist, when he has a theory and the facts are borne out by whatever the theory is, he will have within himself tremendous satisfaction that he has uncovered that. And that a real scientist in that case is not interested to publish it.

Your see, that really would be a proof, the same way as an obyvatel is not interested in any name. But whenever there is any particular questioning about it from someone he would consider a hassnamuss or a nincompoop that he would say "You don't know what you're talking about. I have spent all my life in finding this out and it, for me, has become absolute truth." An obyvatel would never make a mistake when he has reached that particular state because it is based on his utter simplicity in which he has taken, you might say, all the experiences of the world that he was capable of and sifted it down and distilled it and made it more and more essential until he finally came to something which for him is as absolute as he can make.

I think that even in that particular pursuit of his, he becomes much more objective regarding himself, and that he is impartial is shown by the fact that he has absolutely no wish to convince anyone unless they tell him and then he would say "shut up."

But when he for himself reaches this particular point of knowing, and knowing with understanding, it is sufficient for him.

An obyvatel reaches the end of his possible life at a time when he has investigated all things and has kept that what was the truth. The scientist can reach it also, but he has a much more difficult road. And there are very few scientists, who just for the sake of science, are interested in the pursuit of knowledge. And the judgement that one can have about such a man is usually that a person, having lost all his own vanity, is no longer then interested in

communicating the fact of their, whatever their wisdom may be, to anyone else on the outside and that instead he has a relationship towards that what is his conscience. And for him, then, his conscience has become his God which of course he worships and to whom, you might say, is willing to dedicate all his works simply for the sake of building up further that what belongs not to him but what belongs to his conscience and his conscience in that case has become entirely, the voice of God, not his own. He has, in truth, lost himself in order to find himself.

As such, as I say, he could be compared to a good scientist, a real honest one, and as such a man who finds out that real melting point is 93 instead of 95 has a chance. But how many are there?

To bring it home. What was the difficulty of Ouspensky? Here was a man who was a mathematician, and published, and a name. Had written a few books... Tertium Organum, New Model of the Universe was not published at that time. Then he meets Gurdjieff. He went to the Far East and looked at this and that and finally discovered someone in St. Petersburg, or Moscow, not only who was fascinating to him, but apparently, gave him information, which he didn't possess, and he was constantly amazed at finding that kind of knowledge right there, in Russia. And so, after some time, he writes up what he has experienced and publishes it, or at least, he writes it sufficiently maybe to wish to publish it, maybe.

But, in any event, what he does do is to publish New Model of the Universe. And in the New Model of the Universe he connected a few things without mentioning any particular source, but, in order to appease his conscience he puts on 1914-1918 at the bottom of each chapter. Indicating that it was revised and that it really belongs to a later period of 1918 but it originally was written in 1914. The dates between 1914 and 1918 was the period where he met Gurdjieff.

And anyone who knows something about Gurdjieff can read in the New Model certain statements which came from Gurdjieff but now were published, of course, under the name of Ouspensky. If that wasn't enough, he then writes fragments and instead of mentioning Gurdjieff, it becomes "G". And so, it goes, without publishing it, because he really didn't dare, but, it is being read, and no one knows who Gurdjieff is because Mr. "G" is a mystical kind of a person who may or may not have existed or still is alive or not, and then comes, of course, the difficulty for Ouspensky to continue, either with Gurdjieff and submit what Ouspensky was for the sake of Gurdjieff and acknowledging him as his guru, or, to go on his own and simply make a statement, "Well, he and I did not see the same way so I went to London."

And so, Ouspensky starts. And starts to have very little contact with Gurdjieff, in the beginning a little bit. In 1922 and 1923 he went to the Priorie a few times and for the rest at that period, he still recommended some people to go and see Gurdjieff, later on the name Gurdjieff was banned and no one was supposed to know who Mr. "G" was.

And so, there went Ouspensky's life. Building up a little bit of meetings and discussions without ever allowing anyone to know where it really came from. And not willing to publish anything in case that he might have to admit that it was not entirely Ouspensky.

This is an example of a man, who had a trouble about his own personality and to some extent, his vanity.

It's not that I want to judge him but this is the way it appears to anyone who knows a little bit about the inside history. And that he could not, not for the life of him, admit that there were certain facts of information, which came from a different source and that instead he could not allow himself, the

big Ouspensky, the man who had published this and that and so forth and was a philosopher, to tell that he was actually, until the end of his life, less than Gurdjieff was.

Well, it's not a question for me to become emotionally involved in that, but there is an example of a man who could not lose himself and who had to remain, for his own self respect, saying what he did, in the way he did it without the proper acknowledgement of the source where it came from.

If you compare that with Gurdjieff, it's quite a different thing. Even Gurdjieff admits that it was not him and that it came, all the time, from material he and several other Searchers of the Truth had gathered during a period of twenty years that we know, more or less, from a description in the stories of "Remarkable Men I Have Met".

As compared to men like Orage, who never questioned for one moment, hesitated for one moment, ever, not to mention Gurdjieff's name. It wouldn't make any difference wherever Orage--and he was a man in his own right, more or less, I would almost say, more than Ouspensky ever was, who had a name at the time () and was completely willing to submit, completely, and remain until the last time, the last day of his life, the pupil of Gurdjieff acknowledging Gurdjieff as a master.

This is what I mean, a person has who has already made a certain name and of course has to stand up for while he remains identified with it, unless he is willing to submit to his own conscience and to say "This is what I thought, now, now I really know and thanks to so and so I know now"--that man's honest.

An obyvatel is like that. He remains an honest man and he will--whatever has given him this kind of an information that he later on that possesses, he will always admit, that it was working in that direction that did it finally and then, as I say, in his simplicity, will admit that it was really the ability,

by being within himself one, giving him then that kind of an insight which he will contribute to the formation of his conscience. And in that, he will be free.

After all, freedom is the thing that counts.

Q: () in order to learn the submission to this observation?

Mr. Nyland: No, no. When I try to become objective and the requirement is that it has to become an impartial observation and also the requirement is that it should take place at the moment. For two reasons. That is, one, the objectivity in the real sense of the word must include impartiality which has to do with an influence of one's feeling center, a certain form of life in this life and a simultaneity which has to do with an intellectual prosperity of the realization of the activity at the moment without a thought, without any kind of an anticipation of the future, or that what is the past and I use that, memory, so for that reason, at least two requirements are needed in addition to just observing.

Then, I start this observation with something that has nothing of its own. That is, I can become impartial regarding my physical body but it is difficult for me to become impartial to something that is already partial. And it is difficult for me to be simultaneous in a thought process to something that is constantly thinking.

You see, for that reason, it is simply a matter of ease, of starting where I have the best chance of success, that I start with an observation of the physical body. And then, while I do this, then I realize that the manifestations of the physical body are very often, and I would almost say, in most cases, the result of that what I feel and the result of that what I think. So that man then becomes not only a physical body but he is dependent on his thought processes as they are and on his feeling processes as they are. And if I observe

the manifestations I can then even place the source of that manifestation to the feeling center or to an intellectual center. When, if I become aware, now in the real sense of the word, of the manifestation of myself, I have a chance that I also become aware of what caused the manifestation wherever it came from, either from the feeling, or, from the mind.

It is as if between the feeling center and the physical center and between the mind and the physical center there are two lines, which then meet in the physical center. And then when I observe the physical center, that is, the totality of my body as manifestations, I may be able to go up the line towards the feeling center, or I may be able to trace it to a mental capacity, a thought of some kind in my mind.

So, you see, I'm not worried about the continuation of an observation of that what is still material or physical.

Gradually, by having acquired a dexterity which now includes that I could become impartial and remain impartial in my observation and that more and more I can understand why it is it has to be at the moment because the thought processes, anticipation and that what is memory, can be reduced to the point of a moment, then, gradually, out of this observation starting with the physical, pretty soon I will have the chance to observe the totality of myself.

You see? One step after the other. I start with that what is the simplest and probably, maybe, the easiest, at least, it is the easiest of the three without forgetting that ultimately, naturally I want to be able to be impartial to the totality of all my functions. All right? --Yes.

Q: Mr. Nyland, I had a task. My task was to walk back and forth in my room five minutes. With my head right with the right foot and left with the left foot and when I came back, do it the other way. It worked well. For some reason, I was lost for a while, it seems. And I tried to do this as impartially

as I could.

Mr. Nyland: About walking, there is really nothing to be partial about is there? There is no particular judgement. There is no particular liking so it is fairly easy to take an ordinary affair like a movement of legs going back and forth simply to transverse the distance of the room walking up and down to become aware of myself. In that way, how often did you walk up and down?

Q: During the five minutes? I don't know.

Mr. Nyland: Did you go slow or fast?

Q: Very slow. Very, very slow.

Mr. Nyland: Did you dream? or fall asleep?

Q: Yes, I did.

Mr. Nyland: Then, when you discovered you had fallen asleep, what did you do?

Q: I tried again.

Mr. Nyland: Did you go back?

Q: Where I started? I didn't.

Mr. Nyland: All right. That's what we'll do next. As soon as you discover you have fallen asleep, you see, then you wake up, you remember then, you must have fallen asleep because you know that you wake up out of the sleeping state, then exactly when you fall asleep again, that is, become unaware, that is difficult to trace but you can trace, quite definitely at the time I wish to wake up to wake up now. You see?

So at the time now that you discover that you had been asleep for a little while, you go back to the other side of the room, then I start over again. This time, you start being awake and now, I will go on with it as long as I can. You will have difficulty and you will try to concentrate on it and make all kinds of grimaces on your face and you will want to reduce the speed of your walking

so as to eliminate any kind of a loss of energy, any kind of a thing that while you walk fast and of course automatically, the energy goes there so there is nothing left for trying to be awake. Problem is, you have to change, you have to sometimes, I've said, put the weight on one foot or the other foot, walk slow, walk fast if you can, big steps, short steps, measuring with one foot in front of the other.

All the time, look at yourself as a little instrument which you now use in order to have the little "I" get some food.

All right? Do it again for a week. It is not a task that runs dry so easily.

Q: Would you also suggest something I could carry through the day.

A: No, not necessarily, because if you do this right you will remember it many times during the day. I'm sure you will remember it, and at that time, when you remember it you could give yourself a task to be awake at that moment. You see, if the memory is strong enough that you remember why you did it and then, you, at that moment, whenever it happens as a thought, to come to you, that you then wake up to whatever you are doing. All right?

Who's in the back?

Q: Phyllis.

Mr. N: Yes, Phyllis.

Q: I would like a task. I would like a task.

Mr. Nyland: Yes, I hear you, Phyllis, I'm trying to think quick. It doesn't seem to me...I gave you a task didn't I?

Q: So far I've only asked for one and you've given me that one and then renewed it.

Mr. Nyland: And then, you should report on it.

Q: I reported on it and you put it on me twice.

Mr. Nyland: But we renewed it, didn't we?

Q: I remember reporting on it twice.

Mr. Nyland: I remember it twice but I told you you were not working.

Q: No, you didn't say I wasn't working.

Mr. Nyland: No? Can I say it now? You see, Phyllis, I don't think that a task does you much good. Because I don't think that you understand as yet what is needed and that a task for yourself would have to be like Steve here, if you only could make yourself walk up and down in your room, no one present but only you, yourself, that then, at that moment, you might be able to understand a little bit what it is to be awake. But I'm afraid you don't want to do that.

Q: You're afraid I don't want to do something...

Mr. Nyland: Yes, because it is so childish.

Q: No, that's not so.

Mr. Nyland: You will do it?

Q: I am here, I am here because I want to learn...

Mr. Nyland: Yes, that I know, but you have to undo a great many things that prevent you.

Q: Pardon?

Mr. Nyland: I say, you have to undo a great many things that prevent you. And you have to allow yourself to be very simple and you now, as a task if that is what you wish, you use this same task that Steve had, you take, you are in a room, you start at one wall, walk to the other, and you try that, to be awake, whatever it means to you, that is, impartially, being present to yourself, as if something is present with you, walking, which, at that moment, is observing you walking.

Q: I do this in a room by myself?

Mr. Nyland: By yourself, for five minutes.

Q: How often.

Mr. Nyland: Three times a day if you can. And, as I explained, slow, not too slow, but you have to get first a taste what it is to be awake to yourself.

Will you do it? Good. Let me know next week.

Q: How can I reconcile the fact that it is impossible to explain, I don't want to explain what happened when I work in words, and yet my mind demands a certain clarity about...

Mr. Nyland: Let your feelings simply operate and let the feeling then give you knowledge.

Q: Well, when I have worked, and am still in a certain state because of that there's no necessity for explanations, but when I'm not in such a good state and work is not going so well...

Mr. Nyland: It won't help you even if you explain it. Your mind won't have that force.

Q: You often talk about the necessity of having ()

Mr. Nyland: It is mental clarity of knowing what to do for work, it does not mean that I wish. The clarity in itself doesn't help at all. It is something that is needed when I want to work, but, when I want to work, I have to have the wish. If that isn't there, there is nothing, but an empty place.

I have said many times about the relationship between the mind and the body even when I look at it and I so-called observe, it will not last unless there is a propelling force to make it, I have called it, go around, mind, body, feeling, mind, body, feeling, when that is there it is like a triangle which then starts to turn when it is propelled by the wish and the original thought is because I wish to start work.

You see, it is never the thought that I want to work I cannot even get rid of it, I say I have a thought that I wish.

Q: I wasn't thinking () of a thought to help me.

Mr. Nyland: No, it won't and then the clarity won't help you. You have to wait until the wish is there. And the wish is based on an entirely different thing. It is based on a realization of what one is. When that gets strong enough so that one really doesn't want to be the way one is. That one is not a fool to know how one is. And that there is enough of a little bit of conscience in oneself to approximate, more or less, that it is so, even if one doesn't want to admit it, or if there are other rationalization processes in the mind that still nevertheless, there is a wish in oneself which at times can be converted into the actuality of doing work. But if it isn't there, the wish is not strong enough, I have to wait. Conditions of life are so that we have enough opportunities which will enable me, any kind of a reasonable being to have a wish at the proper time for, perhaps, a change. It may be that I want to change, that I see what I am and the wish is to change. And this wish to change is now converted into a wish to wake up without wishing for a change. This is the difficulty, it is possible. You understand what I mean?

Save your energy. Don't waste it. Don't make it or force yourself. It is far better to reduce yourself as you are, at such a time to a state of-- I call it simplicity. It simply means relaxation. It means a lowering of the different activities in the body to a minimum. That what is needed simply for the maintenance of it. So that then whatever energy there may be in the form of a wish really has a chance to operate. And, if that doesn't work, prayer. One can come, at such a time, to oneself and that, whatever is prayer, will be centered in a wish.

But for that, one has to know prayer and also one has to be free enough to wish to pray. Not many people really want to pray. But if one wants to, it is very helpful for the wish.

Come, children, no more questions?

Q: Mr. Nyland, I am not here very often and because of that, I've sort of set my own task. I would like to report on a few of those results because they puzzle me and when I (). One of the things I'm listening to some tapes.

Mr. Nyland: Why don't you come oftener?

Q: I live in Washington. My husband comes and I've listened to tapes so that I've heard some of the tasks.

Mr. Nyland: Well, are you going to be here for the summer.

Q: Yes.

Mr. Nyland: Good.

Q: I have about six more weeks of work, my own work, but I was hoping for a task.

Mr. Nyland: During that time?

Q: During that time.

Mr. Nyland: Well, that's good. Let me hear some of the self-imposed tasks.

Q: One of them is a week of watching facial expressions, and another one is that I have a very hard time of remembering myself during the day, when I'm working and I hung something in the doorway so that when I go through it will bump into me and then I would stop.

Mr. Nyland: Did it help?

Q: It seemed to. I would certainly stop and I would sort of relax because I'm tense. It wouldn't last very long, I would be again ~~impaired~~ tensed.

Mr. Nyland: Would the result be waking up?

Q: I find it hard to say. I would be aware of myself. I learned how tense I was and how fast I was going.

Mr. Nyland: That's right. But when you are tense and you are aware, you certainly are not impartial. It would be very difficult to accept the

tenseness without wishing to change it because you've had a judgement. You see, then immediately when you have a task you set for yourself you remain subjective about it. This is the difficulty, although naturally it is quite possible to do but very seldom it has success.

It amounts to giving yourself certain different ways of doing certain things, but unless it is quite definitely in touch with the wish to be awake, for that reason, the task is done for that, and it is not done in order to change or in order to so called remind oneself, one doesn't, even if you bump into it you don't stop, you don't change, you don't allow at that moment to take that energy and say "I wish to be present to myself now."

Washing dishes. Good task. Maybe (not clear) even cleaning. Every time ^{stop}, wait, so that you will realize that much of that is quite mechanical.

And you do your washing, put it away, if at that moment, you come to yourself, you see yourself, you become aware of a body which is actively engaged in doing a necessary thing, and you then, in stopping, you might say, the spell of a habitual, or mechanical movement, and at that time one becomes aware or at least has a chance to ~~become~~ aware of what's up standing there and the fact of stopping it is an unusual one because it is utterly silly to do that when you're washing dishes so it comes home to one that you do it for a definite reason.

If when you can stop, and you can do this as frequently as you wish, allowing yourself enough time, of course close your eyes, at that moment and then see if you are aware, or could be aware of yourself, impartially, standing, as a body, you know yourself well enough and there is nothing special or beautiful or esthetic about that kind of a ^{movement} so you don't have to like it. But simply to be aware, and awake as you can maintain it for a certain length

of time and then, very slowly, go back again into ordinary life, holding on as much as you can to the realization of that awareness. All right?

Q: Does this mean that there is...I find that when I'm doing this when I'm in all these situations that the mind is somehow more than anything else in it.

Mr. Nyland: Not necessarily. Your mind will continue with all kinds of little thoughts. What happens is that a certain part of the mind is used for it, you see? And that mind is very different because it is not used to being used. It is virgin field as it were.

No, the difficulty is to start operations there. You know, it is like breaking ground for building a house. There is nothing, only a little material. There is a certain mental gray matter that could start to function and since it is virgin, it has a chance to start without any associations.

You see? The possibility is very good for it. It is actually the soil to start with, but one has to cultivate it and plant it. And it is a certain section, if one wants to think about and localize it. It is on the side lobes of your head, above the temples. That is where it can start to function in an objective way. And it doesn't matter where it is. It is at least part of your brain and the rest of the brain continues in the same way.

Now, if I try to do it and the rest of my brain is filled with all kinds of thoughts, of course there is very little chance. It is as if all the thoughts in one's brain make so much noise that that what starts to function in a very small way is scared out.

All right? So you take it at times when there is not too much activity in your head. When there is no particular activity in your feelings and when there is simply operation of the physical body doing something, and then you try to () what one simply does. To wake up to yourself, to be as if present to

yourself and do this several times in an activity. As I say, you can close your eyes if you wish. You can breathe at that time and simply then, come more to yourself.

Sometimes, in ordinary life we call it "come to myself", detect one's presence, it is very much () all right?

For two weeks, let your husband know or drop me a little note, and then we'll change it, because...six weeks you said? It's a little too long. Let me know in two weeks, all right? I hope I answer you.

Q: Mr. Nyland, I wonder if you can tell me, I'd like to know why it is that I can't seem to maintain the force or whatever it is that I get here on a Monday or on a Wednesday. It seems as if in a day or two to die out.

Not the wish to work. It seems to me that's always there. But many of the times it's confined to just a thought process.

Mr. Nyland: Then we'll say it's the same trouble of changing the thought into a wish. Then you will perhaps admit that the wish is born, more or less, by coming to a meeting because a certain form of being affected by it or excited by it or at least that one is in a little different emotional state. Then with that you go home and say "Yes, now I want to." You know? And then, after a little while, it runs dry, it doesn't last because it is not sufficient. In order to maintain it, it has to be fed. And you have to find out how to feed it. And the mind will not automatically convert it into that kind of a wish. Because the language between the mind and the language of your feeling center are (not clear). They don't meet. There is not even a dictionary to translate one into the other. It's completely separate from each other, and only if they know that they have each other's existence, as it were, there is no possibility of communication.

So, you see, you have to put it on a basis of what is my feeling capable

of because that becomes the motivating force of any kind of a wish to work. If you start to realize what you really are, that is if after you state this to yourself, how in hell's name is it possible that I forget? Why is it that I should only have a thought. What is it in me that prevents me from wanting to have a wish? Do I wish now, to change that state of having only a thought? How serious do I want to become? Do I feel that when I have the thought that it is sufficient? You see, this becomes the crux of the matter.

Am I satisfied by just having a thought or is there something that I consider lacking in me. Sometimes it will produce a wish. It all depends on how you judge it as some form of behavior or manifestation of yourself, running around with the idea that you have the thought that you ought to work, and you don't, and when you keep this a sufficient number of times in front of yourself, you start evading it.

This is a question of your own seriousness. The more I'm confronted with the fact that I'm incapable, the more I want to realize that I don't want this incapability, but then I wish to become a man. The more I will wish to overcome that particular handicap.

It is one way. The other is, of course, that I realize that it is necessary for man to develop all three possibilities for himself. His physical center, his emotional one or his feeling center, and his mind. That is the mind already, apparently, as far as work is concerned, has enough thoughts but they do not translate. But then, in my feeling center, I apparently don't have any wishes that have to do with work. So that I start now, to consider what is it that could give me in my emotional center an impetus, that I wish to work. Sometimes I say I force myself to think about it.

Sometimes I say I will make myself do certain things against the grain so as to produce in me a wish either to continue it or not. Sometimes, I want to

read. Sometimes there are enough opportunities to talk about it, to get inspiration from someone. Sometimes I want to sit quietly and see if there is anything left that I would call a feeling and what does it wish to feel?

You see, if you start to study yourself a little more, ~~Where~~ is your wish? For what? Not necessarily a wish of the body. Those are little wishes and one satisfies them more or less. But what is there as a wish in an emotional sense? What is there in your feeling that you really want for yourself?

You say development, yes, in what way? How? What are you willing at that time, even, to pay for that of becoming interested in wanting to find out. What was the meaning of let's say Nietzsche? Or Krishnamurti, or Blavatsky, or whoever it may be? What is it that I consider in myself important. Sometimes I say my spiritual development. But what do I do? How much attention do I pay to it? If I say it, is it a lip service or is it an actuality that I have a very definite wish to develop that.

Religiously speaking again, is it as a question of prayer or a question of a relation to a God, then how am I as a man looking up towards God, wishing him to help me. Do I really wish? And what would I do if all of a sudden he came down and said "Here I am, now what will we do?" What would you do?

You see, that the question of one's seriousness is right. And many times with my mind I live on the periphery. It is the easiest because it doesn't engage me enough. And sometimes with my mind it doesn't even make a necessity of doing any physical work. I can keep a lot of thoughts going in my mind in my chair, and sit and dream about it and naturally have a good time.

This is the second way. The third way is that I use my physical center. That I make myself, I may be lazy in my mind and I may not have any wishes in

my feeling center. But now my body has got to do the job. And something in me tells me "Now you're going to work, this time real work." And you make yourself get over a certain laziness or a lethargy in actually physically performing certain things and nonsensical or not, it doesn't matter as long as that damn body is busy and it has to work--almost I would say, for a living. It's to produce a feeling. You will take it, at times you will be disgusted with yourself, you will also realize how damned lazy it is and still, something in you becomes much more interested in making this body function in a certain way, the way it ought to be, and you give it then maybe some task, a little bit of a task, sometimes you will say you will only get half a piece of bread and not more, and no butter or whatever it is that you want to teach your body, give it a lesson to wake it up, as it were, to give it a chance to function a little bit differently. And it is exactly in these differences that I'm reminded that I do it for a definite purpose, to get a wish out of it.

You see, feelings will be employed in the body which is unwilling. And then, if I know that I do it for that kind of a purpose that somehow or other, I want a different kind of a wish, the energy that has been made by making the body do this I can use now for another kind of a purpose.

You see what I mean? It is far from hopeless. When one really wishes you can. But don't run around saying I cannot do it, I cannot do it, I cannot do it.

Q: I'd like to ask a question. Sufi and Gurdjieff. I read the book by Shah this week and I find that Gurdjieff did draw much of his information not only from Sufi but there are quite a few parallels. There is a concept detaching something from something else, need for work.

Mr. Nyland: Now wait a minute! Not need for work, it is not defined.

Q: He speaks of work, then he speaks of work as a part of the work he

says at the beginning there is a need to remember oneself. He defines this --this is in the annotations at the end of the book--this is only at the beginning of work. In a general way he says that is sort of a way of seeing oneself in a variety of situations and this is not to be carried on after the initial phases after you enter the official Dervishhood, only at the beginning because it becomes repetitious and apparently, he seems to imply that it is of little value after the initial phases. This is quite a bit of difference from your statements that it is of course always necessary work throughout the time of your life in order to build something and so I'm wondering if you could amplify in general on what Gurdjieff did extract from Sufi, the influences it had upon him, and so forth.

Mr. Nyland: I think that Gurdjieff of course was influenced a great deal by Mohammedanism and particularly Sufi, because it is the principal branch of Mohammedanism, but he was also influenced by many statements of Vedanta and anything that has to do with the Upanishads or the Bhagavad Gita or things of like that. But you will find a great deal of similar information in the variety of different eastern and far eastern religions, near east and far east, and that of course this whole question of objectivity with that kind of a freedom or entering into a different kind of a form of life where one is not any longer bound by the bondage of earth that that is underlying practically every religion.

So you see, one doesn't have to go to the Sufi business for it. But then there is, of course, either an influence direct or subterranean influence or a similarity. I don't think there is any question about it.

But when they talk about work it is a very stretchable kind of a concept and unless it is spelled out what "work" means, which you don't get out of the little Sufi book of Shah. But you may be able to get out of a real study.

of that kind of religion that there are precepts and definite orders and it's such a limit beyond the dogma which is published, and if one wants to delve into that and live with it for some time, one will discover many, many statements that have to do with an esoteric knowledge. This is not so easily published.

How much there is depends entirely on how much one is connected with it and I think that Gurdjieff investigated for twenty years that particular section of culture, and going from Turkestan to Persia and back and forth, that during that time he em() and took in different monasteries and obtained a great deal of information that was available there.

Now in how far we can reconstruct it as Sufi and by reading a little bit about it, I doubt very much that it is much. I think we can have more or less an idea that it is there, the same way as if with a sacred doctrine you know there is something there but who's fanning it? You know it is always that same kind of a problem.

If I want to become a good Mohammedan and I read the Koran and I understand more and more about Mohammed and then go over into Sufi and not only read Shah but whatever different forms there are now in Sufi literature, it becomes a little bit more clear to me how little there is that I can take in unless I live in that atmosphere. But that there are similarities, there are practically in all kinds of religions that have any particular meaning, and particularly those religions that emphasize the necessity of work, naturally it is called oneself, but what is this self and what is it that I, in meditation or even in contacts, in mystical contacts, would become, if I can, during such a time of meditation be free from that what is subjective, of course it is an ultimate aim, but if I continue to do that by means of thought, I will not reach it.

~~not reach it.~~

If I do it by means of the introduction of something new, like objectivity into a mental process, there is a possibility. And I think that is quite definitely emphasized in Sufi.

Q: Do you think this concept of self remembering is different from Gurdjieff's?

Mr. Nyland: Yes, I think so, I think so, because that self is described as something that one ought to be different from ordinary life without stating that the introduction of something entirely different has to happen. And that that difference is only a gradual one as you go over from one state into another simply by an evolutionary process instead of by a stepwise process.

That, I think is the difference. I don't think, at least I haven't seen it in any Sufi, such prescriptions as to what is necessary to undo subjectivity. But, let's continue to study it. I certainly don't want to put any damper on that.

So, hah, I've seen you look at me a few times. End of one, the other one is at the end already?

Everything ending. So God damn the end to anything. How was the noise, not so bad. It actually helped.

Where are you, Mark?

Q: It called for an increase in temperature, though.

Mr. Nyland: Ah! But that will speed up the process of imbibition. Imbibing. You know, it might even help because that kind of a friction can then produce discomfort and the discomfort being unusual might remind you to wake up.

So I'll see you next week, I hope. Goodnight, everybody.